

REPORT of May 26th MEETING of the FFCC

A meeting of the Fusion Facilities Coordinating Committee was held at PPPL on May 26th. The FFCC participants in the meeting were Rich Hawryluk, Ian Hutchinson, Martin Peng, Ned Sauthoff, and Ron Stambaugh with Ben Carreras participating by teleconference. In addition, Tony Taylor, Erol Oktay, Don Priester, and Rostom Dagazian attended the meeting and Ray Schwartz and Warren Marton participated by teleconference.

The meeting began with a general discussion of the requirements for peer review. Erol Oktay briefed the group on the development of a general policy document within OFES regarding peer review. At present, a policy on peer review of theory contracts has been developed and posted on the Web. The FFCC has been asked to develop a similar document for the national fusion facilities, C-Mod, DIII-D, and NSTX. One general comment regarding the proposed general policy document was whether the Office was mandating peer reviews or expert reviews. The latter take into account mission impact as well as quality of science issues. The group felt that mission impact needs to be addressed and that should be incorporated into the policy document explicitly.

Regarding the specific issue of a policy for the large fusion facilities, we had agreed at the outset of the meeting that we would discuss general issues and not attempt to develop a consensus. This was done for two reasons. The first was that the two PAC chairs with University affiliation were not available and their perspective would be valuable. The second was that this is a complex issue and the head of each of the national teams needs to discuss this issue further with their teams. Nonetheless, a plan was developed for making further progress on this issue. The first step was to identify key issues that a proposed plan needs to address:

- National Labs need to be reviewed along with universities and industry.
- Process must enable new groups to participate in research on national facilities.
- Goal should be to create the “best” team for an integrated program.
- NSTX needs to formulate a five year review cycle like the C-Mod and DIII-D review.
- What is the relationship of PAC to peer review?
- Who is responsible for the integrated program with authority and responsibility distributed?
- How are grants coordinated with the requirements for the program on the facilities?

The next step will be for PPPL and GA to discuss these issues with their collaborators and develop a proposal regarding how to proceed. MIT and GA plan to distribute to the committee how they are presently reviewed. (MIT has already done that.) On July 21st at 1 p.m. (EDT), we will have a teleconference call to continue our discussion of this rather complex issue. After the meeting, Rich Hawryluk had a brief discussion with John Willis. John indicated that while he appreciated the efforts of the FFCC on this matter, he expects the Office to issue a policy for our review and does not expect us to develop a draft policy. Nonetheless, it would be useful for the FFCC to develop proposed resolutions for the key issues we have identified.

The committee discussed the charter for the Fusion Facilities Operating Committee. The FFCC was supportive of the direction of this group and provided comments on their charter.

The committee discussed the “Publications Principles” which had been previously distributed. The proposed resolution of the comments by Hawryluk/DeLooper was not accepted. In particular, the committee identified that some Universities did not have mechanisms in place to implement the proposed procedure and that the host needs to take on the responsibility for organizing this effort. Hawryluk will work with DeLooper on revising the document. One suggestion which came out of the discussion is to post draft publications on an internal web-site and to notify by email the team members that a draft exists and enable them to provide comments to the authors or to management as appropriate.

At the meeting, Tony Taylor and Ned Sauthoff, who had attended the IPPA working group meeting, gave the committee a brief report on the status of the report. At the meeting, a copy of Chapter 3 was distributed. Afterwards, a copy of the entire report was sent to the committee. A conference call will be held on June 9th at 11:30 a.m. to discuss this and develop a FFCC position on this.

The committee discussed providing a response to Charlie Baker's request for priorities on VLT activities. Ron Stambaugh is circulating a draft response for comments. A more general issue came out of this discussion which is the need to develop an integrated experimental/theory/technology effort on rf. During the 70's substantial resources were devoted to (positive) neutral beam injection, resulting in a very successful heating system for the experimental programs. Though substantial progress has been made in rf heating and current drive, the launchers continue to pose significant issues which require an integrated approach to their resolution. One comment was made was that we need to take rf from being an art to being a science just as was done with neutral beam injection.